Member's representation

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, yesterday, I gave a letter alout my short Notice Question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think, we have sent it to the Minister.

BOMBAY PUBLIC TRUSTS (MYSORE AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959.

Introduction

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I beg to introduce the Bombay Public Trusts (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1959.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bombay Public Trusts (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1959 is introduced.

RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN THE MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Motions to amend.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendments tabled by Hon'ble Members, Sri Kothavale and Sri G. N. Puttanna be taken into consideration. I will read rule 327:

"When the motion is reached, the Speaker shall read the draft amendments and ask whether the member has the leave of the Assembly. If objection is taken, the Speaker shall request those members who are in favour of leave being granted to rise in their places, and if not less than twenty members rise accordingly, the Speaker shall intimate that the member has the leave of the Assembly. If less than twenty members rise, the Speaker shall inform the member that he has not the leave of the Assembly."

Have the amendments proposed by Hon'ble Members Sri Kothavale and Sri G. N. Puttanna leave of the House?

The motion was adopted.

The necessary leave is granted. The amendments would be taken up one by one.

Sri S.D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That after rule 15, the following new rule shall be added—

"15-A. At the commencement of every session and after the new members, if any, have taken their seats, the Secretary shall lay on the Table of the Assembly, a list of Bills which have received the assent of the Governor or the President."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That after rule 15, the following new rule shall be added—

"15-A. At the commencement of every session and after the new members, if any, have taken their seats, the Secretary shall lay on the Table of the Assembly, a list of Bills which have received the assent of the Governor or the President."

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment proposed is a very simple one. It recognises the prevailing practice. Hon'ble Members know that at the beginning of every session, the Secretary lays on the Table of the Assembly, the Bills which have received the assent of the Governor. Thereis no rule authorising such action on the part of the Secretary. Hence, I propose this amendment. I request the Assembly to accept it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That after rule 15, the following new rule shall be added—

"15-A. At the commencement of every session and after the new members, if any, have taken their seats, the Secretary shall lay on the Table of the Assembly, a list of Bills which have received the assent of the Governor or the President."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to Rule 16.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move :

"That for sub-rule (2) the following sub-rule shall be substituted—

"(2) On the prorogation of a session, all pending notices shall lapse except those in respect of motions the consideration of which has been adjourned to the next session and Bills which have been introduced."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That for sub-rule (2) the following sub-rule shall be substituted—

"(2) On the prorogation of a session, all pending notices shall lapse except those in respect of motions the consideration of which has been adjourned to the next session and Bills which have been introduced."

Hon'ble Members are aware that on the prorogation of a session all pending notices generally lapse. But in the present rule 16 (2) certain exceptions have been made. If the Hon'ble Members make a reference to sub-rule (2), they will find :

"On the prorogation of a session, all pending notices shall lapse except those in respect of statutory motions, motions for amending rules, motions the consideration of which has been adjourned to the next session and Bills which have been introduced."

Under the present rule, statutory motions and motions for amending rules do ,not lapse. But the present amendment is meant to make statutory motions and motions for amending rules also lapse on the prorogation of a session. But there are certain motions which do not lapse and they have been mentioned in this amendment. Hon'ble Members will find that statutory motions and motions for amending rules do not find a place in the Lok Sabha Rules. Hon'ble Members will be pleased to see that the old Legislative Assembly Rule 13 is also to the same effect. The reason is this : when statutory motions are made or motions for amendments of rules are made, it is likely that when the next session starts that circumstances may change and the members may not be in a mood or may not like those motions to stand. If they have any idea to move them, it is open to them to do so again. My amendment proposes a general rule which is recognised all over India and by all parliamentary institutions.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palyam).—So far as this is concerned, I am obliged to oppose it for the following reasons : the reasons advanced by my friend are not convincing, namely, because the Lok Sabha Rules do not provide for it, let us not provide for such a contingency. If the changed circumstances do not warrant such motions to be moved, the members concerned will withdraw that statutory motion or the motion to amend rules. Why should we not provide for that ? The framers of the Rules thought it proper and incorporated these things and I do not see why those should be excluded now. Mere prorogation of a session should not allow the motions to lapse. Despite the fact that the session is prorogued, they should be made to survive.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The general idea in the amendment now proposed is that only those motions of which the Assembly is seized should survive and not others.

†Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum).—I should like to know the reason why these two special cases have been mentioned in the rules when they were framed. It appears that some distinction has been made between ordinary motions and statutory motions which seek to amend the rules. When special cases have been accepted in the previous rule, I think there is no reason why there should be again a modification of those rules. I think, there is absolutely no inconvenience caused to our Assembly so far as these two

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

categories are concerned. There is not even a single instance. The only argument that has been advanced by the mover is there is no such provision in the Parliament Rules and that is why he wants to change it. I think, Sir, if the statutory motions are allowed to lapse, it will be merely a repetition in the next session. At least the statutory motions should be made to survive even after prorogation. So, I will submit that the arguments advanced by the Hon'ble Member are not at all convincing, but on the contrary, the statutory motions must be made to survive.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no question of reply. I will put the amendment to the House. As I have already explained the point is that those motions of which the House is not seized but only notices have been served should lapse and those motions of which the House is seized and motions the consideration of which has been adjourned, and Bills which have been introduced should not lapse; in other words notices of all motions of which the House is not seized under Rule 17 should lapse.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That for sub-rule (2) the following sub-rule shall be substituted:

"(2) On the prorogation of a session, all pending notices shall lapse except those in respect of motions the consideration of which has been adjourned to the next session and Bills which have been introduced."

The motion was adopted.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Rule 18. I beg to move:

"That the present rule shall be numbered as sub-rule (2) and the following added as sub-rule (1) —

"The Speaker shall report to the Assembly that the Governor was pleased to address the Legislature and place a copy of it on the Table of the House."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved

"That the present rule shall be numbered as sub-rule (2) and the following added as sub-rule (1).—

"The Speaker shall report to the Assembly that the Governor was pleased to address the Legislature and place a copy of it on the Table of the House."

†**Sri S.D. KOTHAVALE.**—The amendment is a very simple one. The point is, at the commencement of the first session of every year, the Governor will be pleased to address a joint meeting of both the Houses and after that is over, the Hon'ble House proceeds to debate on the Governor's Address but no record is made as such. Unless there is some provision to show in the record that the Governor has addressed the Assembly, it becomes difficult for the Hon'ble Members of this House to proceed with the debate. Hence a formal amendment is needed and that is what I have moved. After amendment, Rule 18 will stand thus.

"18 (1) The Speaker shall report to the Assembly that the Governor was pleased to address the Legislature and place a copy of it on the Table of the House.

(2) The Speaker shall, in consultation with the Leader of the House, allot time for the discussion of the matters referred to in the Governor's Address to the Houses under article 176 of the Constitution."

The purpose of my amendment is to have a formal record and enable the Speaker to make a report to the Assembly regarding the Governor's Address. I think the House will please accept the amendment.

†**Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.**—I have to submit that this amendment also is not necessary for this reason. Under article. 176 of the Constitution the Governor would be addressing the Legislature and after that, under rule 18, the Speaker, after consultation

with the Leader of the House would fix up the time for taking up discussion on the Governor's Address. So the Governor is to address the Legislature as per the provision incorporated in the Constitution. Whether the Governor has to address the Legislature or not is in the provisions of the Constitution and after he delivers the address, It becomes a fact. Then this House is seized of that matter and there is no necessity for the Speaker to report the same to the Assembly and place a copy of it on the Table of the House inasmuch as a copy of the very address itself will have already been circulated or delivered to each of the members of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—According to the amendment proposed, the Speaker has to report; that is all.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—There is no necessity, because the House is already seized of that matter. As soon as theGovernor under article. 176 of the Constitution delivers the address, this House becomes seized of the subject. Therefore, there is no question of again our being made known about the address having been delivered by the Governor. Therefore, I submit there is no necessity for the Speaker again to report to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is in the old rules.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It might be. As soon as the Governor delivers the address, are we not taking it for granted that the address is delivered? There is no necessity of our being made known again by the Speaker that the Governor has delivered the address; so there is no necessity of the Speaker making any report of a fact which is already within the knowledge of all these members. No useful purpose would be served at all by incorporating this amendment; it is superfluous.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Governor's Address is an address to both Houses of Legislature and unless the Speaker reports to the Assembly that His Excellency the Governor was pleased to address the Assembly his speech will not form part of the proceedings of this House.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The purpose is to have a permanent record and I do not know why the Hon'ble Member is objecting to have only a formal record of the whole thing.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The moment the Governor delivers the address, the House becomes seized of it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There will be no record unless the Speaker reports to the House.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I know that this rule has been brought for being included in the rules. There is no rule to this effect. I do not know whether there is any such rule either in the British Parliament or any other Parliament that the Speaker has to report when the Parliament was addressed by the King.

†Mr. SPEAKER.—There is. After Her Majesty the Queen addresses both the Houses, the Speaker of the House of Commons reports saying that Her Majesty the Queen was pleased to address both the Houses of Parliament.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—It relates to the question of debate on the Address of the Governor; so we cannot debate the Governor's Address unless the Speaker makes a further report. If that is the position, that will be a restriction which is not contemplated in the Constitution. If the Speaker's report thereon is to be deemed necessary, would it not amount to an unnecessary restriction?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Unless the Speaker reports that His Excellency the Governor was pleased to address members of this House, it will not form part of the proceedings; and the address of the Governor cannot be printed in the proceedings of this House. It is more a formal affair in order to facilitate the recording of his speech in the proceedings.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment to the House. The question is:

"That the present rule shall be numbered as sub-rule (2) and the following added as sub-rule (1).—

"The Speaker shall report to the Assembly that the Governor

(MR. SPEAKER)

was pleased to address the Legislature and place a copy of it on the Table of the House."

The motion was adopted.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Sir, I move :

"That after rule 31 the following rules shall be added as rules 31A and 31B.—

"31A. A resolution of congratulation or condolence may, with the permission of the Speaker and subject to the provisions regulating the discussion of resolutions, be moved at any time.

"31B. The Speaker or a Minister or a member with the permission of the Speaker may make a reference of congratulation or of condolence, and the Assembly may approve the reference without a formal resolution duly placed before the Assembly."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That after rule 31 the following rules shall be added as rules 31A and 31B.—

"31A. A resolution of congratulation or condolence may, with the permission of the Speaker and subject to the provisions regulating the discussion of resolutions, be moved at any time.

"31B. The Speaker or a Minister or a member with the permission of the Speaker man make a reference of congratulatioy or of condolence, and the Assembly may approve the reference without a formal resolution duly placed before the Assembly."

†Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—These are new rules and need hardly say anything in support of these rules. On the floor of the House many occasions arose when members wanted to make reference or table a resolution of condolence, but there was no provision and difficuity was felt. It appears on several occasions such resolutions, congratulations and references have been moved and representations have been made. It is better there are definite rules regarding the subject and hence I move that the new rules 31A and 31B be added to the rules.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I want to know in which cases congratulations are sent. We cannot exclude opposition, condemnation of things; even those things can find a place.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Probably the Hon'ble Member wants to suggest that this rule and the power given by this rule may be abused; but I do not think the Hon'ble Members will abuse it. Supposing resolutions are to be moved and references are to be made with the permission of the Speaker; there will be a check.

2-30 P.M.

The necessity for these rules have been felt. Therefore I would request the House to accept the amendment.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I do not see any purpose behind the amendment. The position is that for condolence, there is no necessity.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a difference. One is a Resolution and the other is a Reference.

Sri M.C. NARASIMHAN.—There are two definitions. There are the ordinary rules for Resolutions like giving notice, etc. Under rule 133 in the case of a Member moving a Resolution, fifteen days notice is needed but in the case of a Minister moving a Resolution, there is no necessity of notice. Therefore a resolution of congratulations can be moved by a Member with great difficulty, whereas on the spot a Minister can move such a resolution. I do not see why a resolution by a member should be subject to the ordinary rules of procedure. I feel that this introduces an element of invidious distinction between a Member and a Minister in the case of a congratulatory and condolence resolutions. Therefore I object to the amendment.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Ordinarily ese things are guided by conventions. Now the conventions are sought to be reduced in the form of rules. Is it

because we have lost regard for conventions ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I agree that they were observed as conventions. It would be convenient if such conventions are incorporated in the rules. I do not think there need be any objection to this.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That after rule 31 the following rules shall be added as rules 31 A and 31 B.

"31 A. A resolution of congratulation or condolence may, with the permission of the Speaker and subject to the provisions regulating the discussion of resolutions, be moved at any time.

"31. B. The Speaker or a Minister or a member with the permission of the Speaker may make a reference of congratulation or of condolence, and the Assembly may approve the reference without a formal resolution duly placed before the Assembly."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 45

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move :

" That for rule 45 the following rule shall be substituted :

"45. Answers to questions which Ministers propose to give in the Assembly shall not be released for publication until the answers have actually been given on the floor of the Assembly or laid on the Table".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That for rule 45 the following rule shall be substituted :

"45. Answers to questions which Ministers propose to give in the Assembly shall not be released for publication until the answers have actually been given on the floor of the Assembly or laid on the Table ".

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The present rule prohibits prior publication of a question, but does not prevent publication of an answer. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that answers are not published before they are given to the House. After all, the answers are more important than the questions.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—.—I am surprised at the amendment. Unless the question is published, the answer cannot be published. How can anyone publish an answer without the question?

Sri S.D. KOTHAVALE.—The question may be published by the member himself who tables it.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—.—I do not think that a person who asks a question would publish the question, and the question is valueless without the answer. Nor can the Minister know the questions to be asked and then publish them. The amendment is, therefore, unnecessary and unwarranted.

Sri M. C NARASIMHAN.—Under the present rules for publication of a question beforehand the member who asks the question is responsible. By the amendment no one would be held responsible but only the office.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The idea of the amendment is that answers should not be published before the question is answered in the House or the answer has been laid on the Table of the House.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Is there any such instance ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. There were one are two instances in Bombay. The amendment would have the effect of giving more scope for the publication in press of the question itself, but the answer cannot be published in advance. That is the case today in respect of the Resolutions, which may be published before ballotting.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That for rule 45 the following rule shall be substituted :

" 45. Answers to questions which Ministers propose to give in the Assembly shall not be released for publication until the answers have actually been given on the floor of the Assembly or laid on the Table ".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—New Rule 45-A.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move:

"That after rule 45 the following rule shall be added:

"45.-A. Where the form or the subject matter of a question is, in the opinion of the Speaker, in contravention of the rules, he may amend the question to secure its compliance with the rules and inform the member concerned accordingly".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved;

'That after rule 45 the following rule shall be added:

"45-A. Where the form or the subject matter of a question is, in the opinion of the Speaker, in contravention of the rules he may amend the question to secure its compliance with the rules and inform the member concerned accordingly".

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—This practice is already in vogue and the Speaker is already exercising such power, but such power is not specifically granted under the Rules. Hence by this amendment I have sought to make an existing practice recognised by the Speaker a rule.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The proposed new rule only confirms the practice which is adopted by the Speaker and it is in the interests of the members. Otherwise there is the possibility of the Speaker rejecting a question instead of amending it so as to conform with the rules. The new rule gives the Chair more power.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That after rule 45 the following rule shall be added:

"45-A. Where the form or the subject matter of a question is, in the opinion of the Speaker, in contravention of the rules he may amend the question to secure its compliance with the rules and inform the member concerned accordingly".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 76.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move:

"That in the proviso to item (*a*) of sub-rule (1) for the word 'report' in line 5, the word 'Bill' shall be substituted".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'That in the proviso to item (*a*) of sub-rule (1) for the word "report" in line 5, the word "Bill" shall be substituted'.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—This is only a verbal amendment. It seeks to use a correct expression where it is not so used.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That in the proviso to item (*a*) of sub-rule (1) for the word "report" in line 5 the word "Bill" shall be substituted'.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 98.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move:

'That in item (iii) after the words "as reported by" the words "a select or" shall be added.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in item (iii) after the words "as reported by" the words "a select or" shall be added.'

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Sub-rule (iii) reads as follows:

"that the Bill as reported by Joint Select Committee be taken into consideration;"

It only refers to Joint Select Committee. It should also include "the Bill as reported by a Select Committee". So by this it is sought to add the words "a select or".

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That in item (iii) after the words "as reported by" the

words "a select or" shall be added.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 136.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move :

"That the present rule shall be numbered as sub-rule (1) and the following added as sub-rule (2)—

"(2) Where the form or the subject matter of a resolution is, in the opinion of the Speaker, in contravention of the rules, he may amend the resolution to secure its compliance with the rules and inform the member concerned accordingly".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That the present rule shall be numbered as sub-rule (1) and the following added as sub-rule (2)—

"(2) Where the form or the subject matter of a resolution is, in the opinion of the Speaker, in contravention of the rules, he may amend the resolution to secure its compliance with the rules and inform the member concerned accordingly".

Sri S.D. KOTHAVALE.—This amendment also seeks to confirm the practice in existence now.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Gubbi).—Cannot this be done by making the necessary alteration in the present rule 136 itself without adding a separate sub-rule (2) ?

Sri S.D. KOTHAVALE.—No. The present rule 136 empowers the Speaker to disallow a resolution whereas the amendment seeks to empower the Speaker to amend the resolution to make it admissible.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the present rule shall be numbered as sub-rule (1) and the following added as sub-rule (2)—

"(2) Where the form or the subject matter of a resolution is, in the opinion of the Speaker, in contravention of the rules, he may amend the resolution to secure its compliance with the rules and inform the member concerned accordingly".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 187.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move :

"That for sub-rule (3) the following shall be substituted.—

"(3) The Secretary shall, as soon as may be, after the Speaker has received such intimation from a member resigning his seat in the Assembly, cause the information to be published in the Gazette and forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission in the case of an elected member and to the Governor in the case of a nominated member for taking steps to fill the vacancy thus caused".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That for sub-rule (3) the following shall be substituted.—

"(3) The Secretary shall, as soon as may be, after the Speaker has received such intimation from a member resigning his seat in the Assembly, cause the information to be published in the Gazette and forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission in the case of an elected member and to the Governor in the case of a nominated member for taking steps to fill the vacancy thus caused'".

†Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—This makes a very small amendment in the old rule as it stands. The old rule only provides that the Secretary shall forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission in the case of an elected member. As the House knows, there is a nominated member also in this House and so there ought to be

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE)

some provision regarding the resignation of a nominated member also. So this amendment seeks to add that a copy of the notification shall be sent to the Governor for filling up the vacancy in the case of the resignation of a nominated member. This is only a formal amendment and it may be accepted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That for sub-rule (3) the following shall be substituted.—

"(3) The Secretary shall, as soon as may be, after the Speaker has received such intimation from a member resigning his seat in the Assembly, cause the information to be published in the Gazette and forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission in the case of an elected member and to the Governor in the case of a nominated member for taking steps to fill the vacancy thus caused"'.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 189.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move:

"That for sub-rule (2) the following shall be substituted:

"(2) If the motion referred to in sub-rule (1) is carried, the Secretary shall cause the information to be published in the Gazette and forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission in the case of an elected member and to the Governor in the case of a nominated member for taking steps to fill the vacancy thus caused."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That for sub-rule (2) the following shall be substituted:

"(2) If the motion referred to in sub-rule (1) is carried, the Secretary shall cause the information to be published in the Gazette and forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission in the case of an elected member and to the Governor in the case of a nominated member for taking steps to fill the vacancy thus caused."

†Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—No special reasoning is necessary in support of this. It is the same as the amendment that was accepted just now by the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

That for sub-rule (2) the following shall be substituted:

"(2) If the motion referred to in sub-rule (1) is carried, the Secretary shall cause the information to be published in the Gazette and forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission in the case of an elected member and to the Governor in the case of a nominated member for taking steps to fill the vacancy thus caused."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment to Rule 202 in the name of Sri Puttanna. He is not here.

Amendment to Rule 243.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Sir, I do not propose to move that amendment and also the one to Rule 243. 242 can only come if 243 is there.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Rule 246. Sir, Hon'ble Members may know that rule 246 is with regard to quorum of a Joint Select Committee. It reads thus:

"The presence of one-fourth of the members of the Committee shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the Joint Select Committee."

This rule is unnecessary and superfluous in view of Rule 197(1) which reads thus:

"Except where otherwise provided the quorum to constitute a sitting of the Committee shall be, as near as may be, one-fourth of

the total number of members of the Committee."

As this is a general rule, it applies to all committees under Chapter 23. Hence, I suggest that this rule may be noted down.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Rule 246 stand part of the Rules."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 255.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move:

"That in rule 255 sub-rules (2), (3) and (4) shall be omitted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That in rule 255 sub-rules (2), (3) and (4) shall be omitted."

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—This Amendment is a very formal one. Hon'ble Members will find the provisions incorporated in these sub-rules are contained in rules 219 and 220. Hence, there is no necessity for these sub-rules. They are superfluous and that is why I am moving for their omission.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in rule 255 sub-rules (2), (3) and (4) shall be omitted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rules 267A, 267B, and 267C.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move:

"That after rule 267 the following rules shall be added as rules 267A, 267B and 267C.—

"Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

267A. (1) There shall be a Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions and shall consist of the Deputy Speaker who shall be the Chairman of the Committee and ten other members who shall be elected by the Assembly from amongst its members according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

(2) The Committee shall hold office for one year or until a new Committee is constituted whichever is earlier.

(3) The functions of the Committee shall be—

(*a*) to recommend the time that should be allocated for the discussion of the stage or stages of each private member's Bill;

(*b*) to examine every private member's Bill which is opposed in the Assembly on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the Assembly, and the Speaker considers such objection *prima facie* tenable;

(*c*) to recommend time limit for the discussion of private member's resolutions and other ancillary matters.

(4) The Committee shall perform such other functions in respect of private members' Bills and resolutions as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time.

267B. At any time after the report has been presented to the Assembly a motion may be moved that the Assembly agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report:

Provided that an amendment may be moved that the report be referred back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter:

Provided further that not more than half an hour shall be allotted for discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion.

267C. 'At the appointed hour, in accordance with the Allocation of Time Order, the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of all the outstanding matters in connection with the completion of a particular stage of the Bill or the resolutino."

3 P.M.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

" That after rule 267, the following rules shall be added as rules 267A, 267B, and 267C.—

267A. (1) There shall be a Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions and shall consist of the Deputy Speaker who shall be the Chairman of the committee and ten other members who shall be elected by the Assembly from amongst its members according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

(2) The Committee shall hold office for one year or until a new Committee is constituted whichever is earlier.

(3) The functions of the Committee shall be—

(*a*) to recommend the time that should be allocated for the discussion of the stage or stages of each private member's Bill;

(*b*) to examine every private member's Bill which is opposed in the Assembly on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the Assembly, and the Speaker considers such objection *prima facie* tenable;

(*c*) to recommend time limit for the discussion of private members' resolutions and other ancillary matters.

(4) The Committee shall perform such other functions in respect of private members' Bills and resolutions as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time

267B. At any time after the report has been presented to the Assembly a motion may be moved that the Assembly agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report:

Provided that an amendment may be moved that the report be referred back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter:

Provided further that not more than half an hour shall be allotted for discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion.

267C. At the appointed hour, in accordance with the Allocation of Time Order, the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of all the outstanding matters in connection with the completion of a particular stage of the Bill or the resolution."

†Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Sir, the three sub-rules deal with the constitution of a Committee on private Members' Bills and Resolutions. Hon'ble Members know that there is a Business Advisory Committee constituted under rules 224 to 230 for purposes of Government business. Those rules do not apply to Private Members' Bills and resolutions. It is expedient to have a Committee on Private Members' bills and resolutions at the present time. The Hon'ble House may be pleased to note that similar provisions exist in the rules of procedure of Lok Sabha and they are dealt with under rules 294 to 297. Therefore, it is expedient to have a Committee of this type. The other day when the Hon'ble Members of this House were discussing a resolution regarding the change of name, *i.e.*, whether our State should be called Mysore or Karnataka, a complaint was made by many Hon'ble Members as to how long the resolution would be continued, whether for 2 days, 3 days or 4 days. Really, there was difficulty. But under the existing rules, there is no provision for regulating the time when resolutions or Bills are moved by private members. Therefore this Committee will enable the House to regulate the consideration of private Members' bills and resolutions. I think the Hon'ble Members will please accept this resolution.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I do not feel that one more committee is necessary. The constitution of the committee contemplates elections also. If he is serious about it he can ask the present Business Advisory Committee to deal with this matter. I do not know why there should be a second Committee. The second difficulty is this: as it stands,

rule 226 does not rule out the possibility of the Business Advisory Committee discussing even private member's Bills. It does not state clearly and explicitly that the Business Advisory Committee cannot allot any time to private Members' Bill, or various stages of the Bill. Sub-rule (3) says that "the Committee shall have such other functions as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time." That gives ample power to the Business Advisory Committee to deal with the question of Private Members' Bill or any other matter that the Business Advisory Committee might consider. No where it has been specifically excluded. The other difficulty is this: the wording of 267A (3) (b) is a little unhappy. It states "to examine every private member's Bill which is opposed in the Assembly..."; the wording is also too much complicated.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before I put the motion to the House, I will draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to Rule 226 Explanation. It says: "The expression 'other business' referred to in this rule and rules 229, 230 means business other than private members' Bills under rule 65 and private membes' resolutions under rule 133." That means, private Members' bills and resolutions are excluded from the purview of the functions of the Business Advisory Committee. That is why a new Committee has to be constituted.

The whole of rule 226 (3) will have to be read in consonance with the Explanation.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Under Rule 226 (1) and (2), functions are clearly defined; it can only be functions other than what is contemplated in (1) and (2).

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is quite clear according to the Explanation that private members' Bill and resolutions cannot be taken into consideration by the Business Advisory Committee. The functions and powers of the Business Advisory Committee cannot in any way cover the private members' Bills and resolutions. That is why this Committee is necessary. I will put the amendment to the House. The question is:

"That after rule 267 the following rules shall be added as rules 267A, 267B and 267C:

Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

267A. (1) There shall be a Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions and shall consist of the Deputy Speaker who shall be the Chairman of the Committee and ten other members who shall be elected by the Assembly from amongst its members according to the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

(2) The Committee shall hold office for one year or until a new Committee is constituted whichever is earlier.

(3) The functions of the Committee shall be—

(*a*) to recommend the time that should be allocated for the discussion of the stage or stages of each private member's Bill;

(*b*) to examine every private member's Bill which is opposed in the Assembly on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the Assembly, and the Speaker considers such objection *prima facie* tenable;

(*c*) to recommend time limit for the discussion of private members' resolutions and other ancillary matters.

(4) The Committee shall perform such other functions in respect of private members' Bills and resolutions as may be assigned to it by the Speaker from time to time.

267B. At any time after the report has been presented to the Assembly a motion may be moved that the Assembly agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report:

Provided that an amendment may be moved that the report be

(MR. SPEAKER)

referred back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter :

Provided further that not more than half an hour shall be allotted for discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion.

267C. At the appointed hour, in accordance with the Allocation of Time Order, the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of all the outstanding matters in connection with the completion of a particular stage of the Bill or the resolution."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER.—The House now rises and will meet after half an hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Fifteen Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Fifty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

MR. SPEAKER.—Rule 307.

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I beg to move :

"That for sub-rules (3) and (4) the following sub-rules shall be substituted :

"(3) If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of a question is challenged, he shall arrange to have the division bell rung for two minutes.

(4) After the lapse of two minutes he shall have the doors closed and shall put the question a second time and invite those who are in favour of the motion to say "Aye" and those against the motion to say "No".

(5) If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of the question is again challenged he shall ask the members who are for "Aye" and those who are for "No" respectively to rise in their places and, on a count being taken, declare the determination of the Assembly. In such a case, the names of the voters shall not be recorded.

(6) If the Speaker does not adopt the course provided for in sub-rule(5), he shall order a division to be taken in such other manner as he may determine."

MR. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That for sub-rules (3) and (4) the following sub-rules shall be substituted :

"(3) If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of a question is challenged, he shall arrange to have the division bell rung for two minutes.

(4) After the lapse of two minutes he shall have the doors closed and shall put the question a second time and invite those who are in favour of the motion to say "Aye" and those against the motion to say "No".

(5) If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of the question is again challenged he shall ask the members who are for "Aye" and those who are for "No" respectively to rise in their places and, on a count being taken, declare the determination of the Assembly. In such a case, the names of the voters shall not be recorded.

(6) If the Speaker does not adopt the course provided for in sub-rule (5) he shall order a division to be taken in such other manner as he may determine."

†SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Rule 307 deals with the question of division. The present rule governing this aspect is found to be insufficient to meet some of the situations which might arise. A situation arose in this House. Members may recall that on that

occasion the bell was rung, members entered the House afterwards and then the doors were closed. Some Hon'ble Members took objection to the procedure on the ground that the ringing of bell for two minutes was unnecessary and if that was done, it would frustrate the aim of the person who demanded a division. Therefore there is need to regularise the procedure in this regard. It will be of interest to the House to know that a similar provision exists in the Rules of Procedure of the Lok Sabha in Rule No. 367, sub-rule 3 (*a*) and (*b*). The rules of old Mysore Legislative Assembly also contained a similar rule. Our present rules do not contain such a provision and the prevailing practice is in accordance with the amendment proposed. Therefore I request the Hon'ble Members to adopt the amendment.

†Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I rise to oppose the amendment. I feel that the provision contained in Rule 307 is comprehensive. The Speaker has ample powers under sub-rule 4 to deal with any situation. We are Members of this House and we are expected to be present when important issues are raised. When a bell is rung the Members who enter may not have heard the arguments advanced by both sides and may not be aware of even the points at issue. Blind voting should not be encouraged. If such a member had probably heard the other point of view, he might be inclined to change his mind. Members should not come to the House merely for the purpose of exercising a vote, that too after a bell is rung. I reiterate that it is the duty of the Members to be present in the House when important issues areraised, hear the arguments of both sides and come to an intelligent decision. This would not be possible under the amendment now proposed. Hence I oppose the amendment.

4 P.M.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—There is another aspect to this question and it relates to the absence of members from the House. As in the Parliament we do not have a Committee on Absence of Members. If there had been a Committee to check the absence of members I could have understood such an amendment. Members are expected to be present when important matters are discussed in the House. I am not suggesting for a moment that exigencies will not arise when members will not be in a position to be present. In an Assembly like ours where there is an extraordinary majority for the ruling party I do not see any need for such an amendment. All these precautions are necessary where the ruling party has only a slender majority as in the case of the previous Kerala Government. Even there the Kerala Assembly did not have this procedure. So my submission is that the existing procedure is quite adequate and these extraordinary precautions are not necessary.

Then, Sir, no occasion has arisen where the Government was defeated on any issue as a result of a division. In spite of the best efforts of the Opposition several times our experience in the past has been that we have never succeeded in defeating the Government and so there is no question of this amendment being brought on account of the present provisions of the rules being inadequate. On the other hand I would say that the existing rules are quite adequate. The present procedure makes it incumbent on them to see that a minimum number of members are always present. The tendency to be absent from the House should be discouraged and not encouraged. That is why I oppose this amendment.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA (Holenarasipur).—I am also opposing this amendment particularly the amendment to sub-rule (3). It says that "if the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of a question is challenged, he shall arrange to have the division bell rung for two minutes". I oppose this. As my friends have already submitted, all the members in are expected to be present in the House when important matters are discussed. I cannot understand why there should be an invitation to the absentee members by ringing the bell for two minutes. The existing provision is quite sufficient and there is no need to make these

(SRI Y. VEERAPPA)

amendments. If the proposed amendments are adopted then the object of our being legislators will be frustrated. Therefore I submit that these amendments are unnecessary.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಇದು ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿದ ಕಷ್ಟವೆಂದು ನನಗೆನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಎಂದೂ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳು ಬಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೆರಡು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಡಿವಿಜನ್ನಿಗೆ ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಪಡಿಸಿದಾಗ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಕಷ್ಟಗಳು ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಂತಹ ಕಷ್ಟ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿತು ಎಂದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಈಗ ತರಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೂ ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕಡಮೆಯೇನಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದೇನೂ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ಡಿವಿಜನ್ನಿಗಾಗಿ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇರಬೇಕೇ ಬಿಡಬೇಕೇ ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಯ ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಬಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಹೊಂದಿರುವ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತವಾದ staff ಅದರ ಮೇಲ್ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ, whip ಇವರೆಲ್ಲ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇನ್ನುಮುಂದೆ ಇದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. Whip, Secretary, ಮತ್ತು Leader of the House ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಇರುವಾಗ ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಷಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ವಿಜಿಲೆಂಟಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನಿರಿಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿದೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇರುವ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಹೆಜ್ಜೆಹೆಜ್ಜೆಗೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಮಾಡಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಏಕೆ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು? ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು Complicated process ಆದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗೊಂದಲಗಳಾಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಏತಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಬೇಕು? ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO (Basavanagudi).—Sir, this is a common practice everywhere. My friend Sri Kothavale has brought this amendment well in time. If such a warning is unnecessary, then where is the need for ringing the bell after interval? Members know their duty and they can as well come and get themselves seated in proper time. If a warning bell is necessary after interval, then a warning of the type contemplated by this amendment is also essential. It is not as if something new has been found out today. By practice elsewhere they have come to the conclusion that such a warning is absolutely necessary. I do not know why my friends there should think that the Congress is going to rule always. Today the Congress may be in a majority. Tomorrow they may be in a majority. Does it follow that it is only the majority that always brings such amendments with a selfish motive behind it? Absolutely not. This is for the good of all. Why should one imagine that this amendment has been brought because the ruling party had some inconvenience in the past? That is not correct. Whatever amendment is brought on the floor of the House, we must view it in its real perspective and we should not go on imagining as to why and for what purpose it has been brought. Let us be clear in our minds that this has been brought for the convenience of all members. This is a warning that is essential. That is the main object with which my friend Sri Kothavale has brought this amendment. It is quite correct and quite essential in my opinion and hence I support it.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್, ಇದುವರೆಗೇನೋ ಅಲ್ಪಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟುಗಳು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಾವೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡೆವು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲು 307ಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಒಂದು ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೀರಿ? ತಾವೀಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನೂ ಎಣಿಸಿದರೆ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೇ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಲು ಆನಕ್ತಿಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಆನಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ರೂಮಿನೊಳಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಕಾಲ ಕಳೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ನೀವೇಕೆ ಗಂಟೆಯನ್ನು ಬಡಿಯಬೇಕು? ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯು ಪ್ರತಿನಿತ್ಯವೂ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಆರಂಭವಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೇಕೆ ಗಂಟೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಮಂಜಸವಾದ ಕಂಪಾರಿಸನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. "ಇಮಾಂ ಸಾಬಿಗೂ ಗೋಕುಲಷ್ಟಮಿಗೂ" ಏನು ಸಂಬಂಧವಿದೆಯೋ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿದೆ.

For example—it is announced as 'Mr. Speaker' so that we may be alert and we may stand up in honour of the Speaker.

ಗಂಟೆ ಏಕೆ ಬಾರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂದರೆ 12-55 ಆಯಿತು, this is the time to enter into the Assembly hall ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಯಲು ಬಾರಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ನೀವೆಲ್ಲ ಒಂದು ವೋಟು ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಲ್ ಹೊಡೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. Sence of responsibility and

sense of duty ಇರಬೇಕು. It is absent among the members of the Treasury Benches. ಅಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದ whip ಆಗಿರುವವರು ಅವರ ಕಡೆಯವರನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾವುಗಳೇನಾದರೂ ಎದ್ದುಹೋದರೆ ಕ್ವೀರಂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋಗುವುದರಿಂದ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಕೂತುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಕೂಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನನು ಕೂಲವಾಯಿತೆಂದು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಗಂಟೆ ಬಡಿಯಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಕೊಠಡಿಯಲ್ಲೋ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆಯೋ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಕೇಳಿಸುವಂತೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕಡೆಯೂ ಗಂಟೆ ಬಾರಿಸುವಂತೆ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ? ತಾವು ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಬೇಡಿ. ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿಯನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ, ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ವ್ಯವಹಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹಾಜರಿರಬೇಡವೇ? ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ನಾವು ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ Deputy Minister also forms part of Government ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಕೊಠಾವಳೆ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಎರಡು ನಿಮಿಷ ಗಂಟೆ ಬಡಿಯಬೇಕು, ಆಮೇಲೆ ಬಾಗಿಲು ಹಾಕಬೇಕು, ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಡಿವಿಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ ಆರುಗಂಟೆಯ ವರೆಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತಿರಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಓಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದಾಗ ಅಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹಾಜರಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾದಾಗ you are failing in your duty ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ವಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಮುಂದಿನ ಸಲಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪಾಠ ಕಲಿಸಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈಗಿರುವಂತೆಯೇ ಇರಲಿ. ಈಗಿರುವ ನಿಯಮವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡ ದಿನ ಇಂತಹ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಗಂಟೆ ಏಕೆ ಹೊಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದೇ ಒಂದು ಗುಂಪಿನವರಿಗೆ protection ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ಬೇರೆ ವಿಚಾರ. ಇದು ವರೆಗೂ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಂದಿರಿ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಂಥ dangerous rule ತಂದು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ಸರ್ವಥಾ ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ.

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ? ಅನುಕೂಲ ಸಿಂಧು ಎಂದು ಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಬೇಡವಾದುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಾರದು. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಬೇಡವೆನ್ನುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಅನುಮಾನವಿದೆ. ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ರೂಲ್ ಏಕೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಏಕೆ ಆರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ? ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಕಾಲ ಈಗ ಇರುವಂತೆಯೇ ಇಡಿ. ಮುಂದೆ ನೋಡೋಣ. ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು contingency arise ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ನನಗಂತೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದದ್ದು, ತಾವು ಹೊರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಪ್ರಾಯಶಃ ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರವಾಸದ ಅನುಭವದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಭಾಷಣಮಾಡಿದಾಗ, ಇವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿ ಇಂಥ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಬಂತೋ ಏನೋ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ let us follow the old rules. ಮುಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅನುಭವವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬೇಕಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡೋಣ.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನನಗೆ ಅಪಾಯ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. It is open to the House to accept it or reject it. ನನಗೆ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಹೌಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ಕುಳಿತು ಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಜಾರು ಆದಾಗ ಅರ್ಧ ಗಂಟೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ವಿಶ್ರಮಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಲಾಬಿ ಇರುವುದು; ಅದುಬಿಟ್ಟು ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಯಿಂದ ಏಳು ಗಂಟೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಲಾಬಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ಸ್ಕೂಲುಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ಗಂಟೆಹೊಡೆದು ಕೂರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ಟೈಟ್‌ಆಗಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಗಂಟೆಹೊಡೆಯುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಬೇಡಿ. ಈಗ ಹೇಗೆ ಇದೆಯೋ ಹಾಗೆಯೋ ಇರಲಿ, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ಟೈಟಾಗಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ತಾವಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ವಾಪಸ್ಸುತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು—ಈ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಬಂದು ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಕೂಡ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದರೆ ಏನು? ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ತಿದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೆಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪನವರು ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೊಠಾವಳೆಯವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟೇರಿಯನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯುತರಾದವರು. ಸಭಾಸದ್ಯರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯೇನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರಿತು ಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಈಗ ಏನು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾಸದ್ಯರ ಘನತೆಗೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ದೇಶದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು. ಬೆಳಗಿನಿಂದ ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲದ ವರೆಗೂ ಕಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಆದೇಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಮ್ಮಜನಗಳು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಆರಿಸಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವಾಗ ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸದೆ ಹೊರಗೆ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಬೆಲ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಒಳಗೆ ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನೆರವೇರಿಸಲಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಆದರೆ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾಸದ್ಯರಾದ ನಮ್ಮ ಘನತೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಅನನುಕೂಲಗಳು ಆಳತಕ್ಕ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಭದ್ರತೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ತರಹ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ತಂದು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಡಿವಿಜನ್‌ಗೆ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಡಿವಿಜನ್ ಬೇಡ, ನಾವು ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ, ಆಳುವ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಇರುವಾಗ ಎರಡು ಜನ ಇರಲಿ, ಮೂರು ಜನ ಇರಲಿ, ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಓಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎನ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹನ್ ಅವರು ಖಂಡಿತ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅವರೇನೋ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ನಿಜ. ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಏನು ಎಂದರೆ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ತಂದು ಅಪೋಜಿಷನ್ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿ ತರುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಗಳಾಗುವುದಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಡಿ. ತಮಗೆ ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಇದೆಯೆಂದ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಪೋಟುಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ನಮ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ. ಏನು ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೋ ಆದನ್ನು ಶಾಸನ ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಖಡಾಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಇದೆ, ಪೋಟು ಮಾಡಬಲ್ಲೆವು ಎಂದು ಇತರ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಡೆಮಾಕ್ರಸಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗಿದೆ, ಹೀಗಿದೆ, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಹೀಗಿದೆ, ಎಂದು ಅವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭಾ ಭವನದ ಆವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡಿಯ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟಿವ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ಏನು ಇದೆಯೋ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತ ನಡೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಕೃತ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರದ ಪರಮಾವಧಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಡಿಸಿ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ನಡೆಸುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಪೋಲೀಸ್ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಗೆ ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರ ಪೀಠಕ್ಕೆ ಇರಬಹುದಾದಂತಹ ಘನತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಕಸಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿ ಬರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸ್ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವೊತ್ತು ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಯಾವೊತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಆರೀತಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಮೂಡಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಆವೊತ್ತು ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನ ಪ್ರಾಕ್ಟೀಸನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಡಿಕ್ಟೇಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕು, ಎಂದರೆ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಳರಸರಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಏನಾದರೂ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ಓಟ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರೊಜೆಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಿಯ ವಾಕ್ ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲ, ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸಂಪರ್ಕಕೂಡ ತ್ಯಜಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡ.—ಕಲ್ಲು ಹೊಡೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ತಾನೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾನದ ಸ್ಯರ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವಗಳನ್ನು ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬರಲು ವಿಪ್ಸ್ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಅವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಅವರು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅವರಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ. ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾದಸ್ಯರಾದ ನಮ್ಮ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಗೆ ಚ್ಯುತಿತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಡಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಬೆಲ್ಲು ಹೊಡೆದು ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮರ್ಯಾದೆಯನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಬೆಲ್ಲು ಹೊಡೆದು ಒಳಕ್ಕೆ ಕರೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಓಟು ಹಾಕಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪೇಪರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಓದುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ.

†Sri F. H. MOHSIN (Hubli City).—My friends on the opposite side seem to think that the amendment sought is only to the advantage of the Ruling Party. But I might say that it is more advantageous to the minority party than to the majority party because the Congress group is always in big numbers even inside the House whereas on the opposite side, we find hardly a few members. They can also take better advantage of the ringing of the bell. After all, the members who are seen in the lounges cannot be said to have no interest in the proceedings. Sri Muckannappa pointed out that many of us were seen in the lounge without taking any interest in the Assembly proceedings. But that is not a fact. We have got a discipline, a Whip and a Leader. We are a disciplined party. But after hearing long and monotonous speeches, it has become rather compulsory for us to go out and have some recreation.

4-30 P.M.

Many a time we see Sri Muckannappa and Puttaramiya going to the Lounge and taking rest for some time.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I am the Whip of the Party. I must consult the members.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—We should think that members on this side are sometimes busy; they also will have some work in the Lounge. If they have no interest in the proceedings,

why should they come here at all ? We cannot conclude that those who sit in the Lounge will have no interest at all. While in the Assembly we are subject to some control, we are not allowed to have a cup of coffee or smoke here in the Assembly Hall, some of us who are addicted to these habits will have to go out and enjoy all these things. If, for these reasons, the members who have got real interest in the proceedings, sit in the Lounge, it is the ringing of the bell which will bring them in. This advantage may be appreciated by the Opposition members. I do not see any reason why the opposition members are arguing against this amendment. Such a provision is made in almost all the Rules of Procedure of the Legislatures of other States; it is also found in the Lok Sabha Rules.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—After 1962 you will experience what it is.

Sri F. H. MOHSIN.—We know what our position is and what it would be in 1962. The rule is meant for all parties. I find absolutely no reason for opposing this amendment. I wholeheartedly support this amendment.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ದೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಜನಗಳು ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಬಸ್ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡುಗಳಲ್ಲೂ, ರೈಲ್ವೆ ಸ್ಟೇಷನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಹೋಟಲುಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಕಾಲದಲ್ಲೇ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೋಟು-ಜೋಪಿಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಮೊನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ನಡೆದ ಆ ಒಂದು ಘಟನೆಯ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲೇ ನಾವು ಕೋಟು-ಜೋಪಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಚ್ಚಿಟ್ಟು ಆಚೆ ತಿರುಗಾಡುವಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಆ ಒಂದು ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಭವಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಶಾಸನಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿನ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಮಾನವಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೂ ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಏನು ಸಂಬಂಧ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ದೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ನಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಪಾಲನಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದೇನೋ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಲ್ಲ " ಮಾಸ್ಟರು ನಿಂತುಕೊಂಡು ಎನೋ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಹುಡುಗರೇನೋ ಮಾಡಿದರಂತೆ " ಎನ್ನುವಹಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಹ ನಾವು ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರತರಾಗಿರದೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ದಿನ ಎನೇನು ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಡೆಸದೆ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆಬಾರದ ಎನೇನೋ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆತ್ತಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೀಗೆಲ್ಲ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ರೂಮಿನೊಳಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಕಾಫಿಕುಡಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು, ನಾವು ರಿಕ್ರಿಯೇಷ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ರಿಕ್ರಿಯೇಷ್ ಡ್ರಾಮಾ ಡ್ಯಾನ್ಸಿಂಗ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಪ್ರದರ್ಶನಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರವರ ಚುನಾವಣಾಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲೇ ಅವರನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯ ಜನರು ಅನೇಕ ಓಪನಿಂಗ್ ಸೆರಮನಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸುತ್ತಾರಲ್ಲಾ ಆಗ ಆ ಚಟವನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲೇ ತೀರಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಹಾಗೂ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಆಯಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರು ರಜಾಗೆತೆದುಕೊಂಡು ತಮ್ಮ ಊರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ನಮ್ಮ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾವಿಜ್ ಇದೆ. If not let them retire from politics if they are so much disgusted. ಆಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಆಗಲೇ 10-12ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ದೇಶಾಡಳಿತ ಭಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊತ್ತು ಸಾಕಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದು ಜನರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವಾಗಿ ನಾವೀಗ ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ರಾಜಕೀಯದಿಂದ ರಿಟೈರ್‌ಮಾಡಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶನೀಡಲು ಬೇಳೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಿದ್ದಿರುವ ಭಾರದ ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನಿಳಿಸಲು ನಾವೂ ಸಹ ಎದುರುಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಕಾತುರರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಯಾರೂ ಜಹಗೀರು ಹಾಕಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ, ಅಥವಾ ಈ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರೇನೂ ಖಾಯಂದಾರರಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜಹಗೀರುಗಳು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ರದ್ದಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಿವೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಅವರ ಅಧಿಕಾರಾವಧಿಯ ಕಾಲ ರದ್ದಾಗುವ ಸಮಯ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈಗಾಗಲೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ನಡೆದ ಒಂದು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದೇ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಸಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಓಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗ ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ 32 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕಡೆ ಕೇವಲ 28 ಜನಗಳಿದ್ದುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಆಗ ಗಂಟೆಬಾರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿದರು. ಹಾಗೆ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಅವರು ಬೆಲ್‌ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಸೋಲಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು ಎಂಬುದು ಇಡಿಯ ದೇಶದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಈಗಾಗಲೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಧಿಕಾರಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರಿಂದ ದೇಶದ ಜನರು ಬಹಳ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಅವರ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ನೀರುಪಾಲಾಗಿವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಈ ದಿವಸ ದೇಶದ ಮೂಲೆ ಮೂಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಆಡಳಿತವರ್ಗದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಯಾವ ರೂಪವನ್ನು ತಾಳಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಮೂಲೆ ಮೂಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅರಿತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎಕ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ (ಕುಣಿಗಲ್).—ನಾನೊಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗತಾನೇ ಎದುರುಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟಿಸಿ ಅವರ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು 32 ಜನಗಳಿದ್ದಹಾಗೂ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕಡೆ 28 ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿದ್ದಹಾಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎಚ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ)

ತೀರ್ಪನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗಾಯಿತು. ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order. ಡಿವಿಜ್ ಆದ ಮೇಲೆ ಓಟಿಂಗ್ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳರಾಗಿದೆ. ಎಣಿಕೆಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಮಾಡಿ ದ್ದಾರೆ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಆ ದಿವಸ ತಾವು ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವ-ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗಾಗಲೀ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗಾಗಲೀ ಕಡಮೆಯಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಅಂಶ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅಡಳಿತಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಮೇಲಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನು ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತಮ-ನಾದವನಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ವರ್ಣನೆಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದು ಆತ್ಮಪ್ರಶಂಸೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ; ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಯ್ಯ (ಚಳ್ಳಕೆರೆ).—ನಾನೊಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವನ್ನುನೂಚಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. "ಅಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಎಷ್ಟೋಪಾಲು ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ" ಎಂದು ಆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಯಮೆಂಟರಿಯೆ? ಅವರು ಉತ್ತಮವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಯಾವ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri T. HANUMIAH.—In what respect he is better, let him say it, Sir.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಪ್ಲಾಟ್‌ಫಾರಂಗೆ ಬರಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಬೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದವರು, ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ನಮಗೆ ನೂಜಿಯಿಂದ ಚುಚ್ಚಿ ಕರೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು! ಅಂಥ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧವೇಕೆ? ಅಂಥ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧದಿಂದ ಅವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಓಟ್‌ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಗತ್ಯವೇನಿದೆ? ಅಂಥವರು ಓಟ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಬೇಡ. ಓಟ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದೂ ಸಹ ಅವರಿಗೊಂದು ಕಷ್ಟದ ಬದುಕು, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜನರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಅಭಿಮಾನ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಅವರವರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯೇನೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರಿತು ಕೊಂಡೇ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವೇ ಇಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಗತಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಮ್ಮತದಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಇರಾದೆಯಿದ್ದರೆ ದೇಶೋನ್ನತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿಮಾನ ವಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೋಥಾವಲೆ ಅವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಪಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಡಿ ಮಾರಣ್ಣ (ಮಾಗಡಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ಸಭಾಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಎಪ ರೀತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಇದನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡದೇಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಪಂಚದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟಿನ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯವಹಾರದಲ್ಲಾಗಲೀ ಇಂತಹ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿರು ವಂತಹ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆ ಸಹ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—These allegations are very offensive and cannot be tolerated. Like a professor of politics he is attempting to teach us fundamentals. We are responsible members and do not want to hear such sermons.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—The member should not be so conceited.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—He has meant dis-respect to the whole House, not excluding the Speaker

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನಾವು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅನ್ನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು? ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ನಾವು ಇತರರಿಗೆ ಅನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧ; ಅನ್ನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧ ವಿಲ್ಲವೇ? You must learn to enjoy a situation. Members should have sense of humour. If something is said that hurts a Member, he should know how to hitback when his opportunity comes. After all, the Member was speaking humorously. I have seen such scenes happening in the House of Commons and there I know Members speak cuttingly against each other. Yet no one takes offence and yet must be some sort of restraint.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Is Sri Puttaramiya the guardian and protector of the Chair?

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—It is as much my responsibility. The member need not teach me.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಡಿ. ಮಾರಣ್ಣ.—ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುವಂತಹ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚಕರು ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ತಂದಿರ ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾರತದ ಇತರೇ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾರತದ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟಿನ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರನ್ನು ನೋಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಕಾನೂನು ಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಅಳವಡಿಸಲಾಗಿವೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು

ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ತಪ್ಪು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತಹ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಮೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಿಗೆ ಮನವರಿಗೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಶಾಸನಸಭೆ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಜರಿಗೆ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಚಾರದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾ ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಪ್ರಚಾರದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯನದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ಅವಮಾನ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥಶೂನ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸಭಾ ನದಸ್ಯನ ತನದ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಗೌರವ, ಅವಮಾನ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಈ ಸಭಾನದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಖಂಡಿತ ಅವಮಾನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಪಂಚದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿರುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗಿವೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲವರು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು, ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು "ಅಪದ್ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು" ಎಂಬ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಈಗಿನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳು ಅರ್ಥಗರ್ಭಿತವಾಗಿವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—"ಅಪದ್ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ" ಎಂದರೇನು? ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಕನ್ನಡದಲ್ಲಿ "ಅಪದ್ಧ" ಎಂದರೆ "ಸುಳ್ಳು" ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಸುಳ್ಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆಅರ್ಥ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. It is a refleation on the Chair.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore city).—The Speaker knows his job and can protect himself.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—The Hon'ble. Member may perhaps be quiet and not try to give rulings on behalf of the Chair. He should learn ordinary things first. ಇದನ್ನೂ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಮಾಡುವುದು ನನಗೂ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವರು "ಅಪದ್ಧಕ್ಕೆ" ಎಂಬ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಆಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಪದ್ಧ ಎಂದರೆ "ಸುಳ್ಳು" ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸುಳ್ಳು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಟ್ಟಹಾಗೆ ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಅದರ ಅರ್ಥ. ಇದು ಅನ್‌ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟರಿ ಹೌದೋ ಅಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think it is unparliamentary. I do not think that the word 'Apadha' means a lie... ಅಪದ್ಧ ಎಂದರೆ ಹಳೆಯ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಅರ್ಥವಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಸುಳ್ಳು ಎಂದಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಕನ್ನಡ ಪಂಡಿತರನ್ನು ಕರಿಸಿ ಅದರ ಅರ್ಥವನ್ನು ವೆರಿಫೈಮಾಡಿ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾಳೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಿ, ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವು ಈಗ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹನ್.—ಕನ್ನಡ ಡಿಕ್ಷನೆರಿ ತರಿಸಿ ನೋಡಿ. ನರಿಯಾದ ಅರ್ಥ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರ್ (ಬಿಜಾಪುರ).—ತಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಈ ಪದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಅರ್ಥ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿ. (ನಗು)

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಡಿ. ಮಾರಣ್ಣ.—ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಂದು ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳೆಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†**Sri M. RAMAPPA.**—Sir, the member who spoke just now is a man of high culture and he is an Assistant Editor, but I am so sorry that he made such a very sarcastic remark. I would request him not to use such expressions hereafter.

While opposing this amendment I would like to say that it is not proper to compare the working of parliamentary democracy in England with what prevails in our country. It is within the knowledge of every one of us that the political parties in India are not developed to such an extent as the political parties in other countries. The ruling party here is like an octopus. Even if 50 per cent of the members of the ruling party are absent, they will be more than the members of the opposition party. The contingency of ringing the bell would arise only if the difference between the ruling party and the opposition is not very much. That is the reason why such a provision has been made in the House of Commons and in the other Legislatures also. I would ask them one question. If this rule is to be found in the rules of other Legislatures, why did they not incorporate it when the new rules were framed by this House? It only means that when a contingency arose in the past they were helpless and so they now want to make this new rule. We know that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance and that is all the more so in democracy. The Assembly members are not automatons. We have not come here just to vote in favour of or against a proposition. We are here to

(SRI M. RAMAPPA)

participate in the deliberations of the House. If you adopt this amendment in our Rules of Procedure it will make the members mere automatons. So my appeal to the Chair is this: please do not make such a provision in the rules. Of all members I never expected a very experienced parliamentarian like Sri Kothavale to encourage this sort of absence by making this relaxation in the rules. If members were to take a little bit of interest, there would be no necessity for this amendment at all. Really we are not opposing this with any ulterior motive. We are opposing this with a sincere desire that members should be present in the House and take part in the deliberations. With that object in view we oppose this amendment.

†Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—Sir, I find from the speeches that have been made opposing this amendment that these friends have taken a different view altogether in this matter and they seem to think that at the time of voting on a particular matter in this House the bell should not be rung. This leads to a more fundamental point which all of us have got to consider before we offer our views in this matter. All of us are here to carry out the responsibility cast on us by the people of the State. We have not come here merely to pass a particular Bill or resolution that comes up before us for voting, but we are here to take decisions as and when occasions arise. If the members who oppose this amendment think that this amendment has been brought in with a view to affording an opportunity to the members of the ruling party to defeat the motions of the opposition, then I submit they are not thinking constructively. More than sitting here as members of the Treasury Benches or as members of the Opposition, all of us are here to shoulder the responsibility of enacting laws and passing resolutions that are of fundamental importance to the people in providing various amenities to the people whom we are representing in this House. I appeal to the members of the Opposition to view this amendment from that responsibility of the members. We have got to take decisions in a constructive manner after a full debate in the House. We should not look at this from a negative point of view. This is a rule which is prevalent in the other Legislatures in the various States in this country and also in our parent House the Lok Sabha. We are anxiously awaiting to hear from you as to the practice that is prevalent in the House of Commons. We feel that this Rule must be prevalent in the House of Commons also. Therefore, nothing new has been sought to be incorporated in our Rules of Procedure. I hope members of the Opposition will look at this from a constructive point of view and cooperate with us by accepting this amendment.

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, it may be a very salutary procedure to adopt what is in vogue in the House of Commons and the Lok Sabha, but there are occasions when we can also create a certain procedure as precedent which can be followed in the other parts of the world also. Time and again it is repeated that the price of democracy is eternal vigilance. I would like to ask Sri Ramappa, is it eternal vigilance if a decision is taken when most of the members are outside and they do not know what is happening? Unless you bring home to all the members the issue under discussion and take a decision when they are present by ringing the bell to enable them to be present in the House for taking the decision, it will not be a proper decision. It will be merely a snap vote and it will not be conducive to a healthy procedure in democracy. It would not also be in the interests of democracy as they put it if the procedure which is sought to be incorporated by this amendment is not adopted.

5 P.M.

We had an experience and a bitter experience about it. We had a controversy also about it. Here, this is only to avoid any such further occasions coming up and it is very necessary that

we adopt this procedure. It may be in consonance with the procedure in other parts. Even if it is not in vogue in other parts, I go a step farther and say that this should be adopted.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—Sir, I shall say a few words because my Hon'ble friends have raised a very important issue. It is rather surprising to hear that a division bell is not necessary. The intention of a Constitution and all procedural rules is to have a correct procedure in the House. It is no use taking a snap vote. Constitutionalists have stated that snap votes do not carry any weight. Therefore, it should be our duty to reflect in our decisions, the correct opinion and the correct vote of the House should be taken. It is no use taking the House by surprise. By doing so, nobody's purpose is served.

It was made out that Hon'ble Members should be vigilant and that they should be careful. I very well agree. But, it does not mean that the Members should be always here in the House. Some reference was made that members went out for relaxation. It would not be fair for members to simply sit here when the subject under discussion is not of any particular interest to him. He may as well go to the library and collect materials to speak on a subject in which he has more interest. He may read there useful things and equip himself with more knowledge about a particular subject which he desires to speak upon. Therefore, it is not a correct conception to say that every member should be present in the House all the time ; that is wrong. Simply because a Member is not in the House, we cannot call him negligent ; it is wrong. Therefore, it is necessary that such a Member should have the advantage of the division bell. One point was made out that a Member who was sitting out and who came into the House when such bell was rung, would not be aware of the subject under discussion. This is absolutely incorrect and unwarranted. Whether he is here or not, every Hon'ble Member has the right to vote on all the subjects when a division is challenged.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—What I said was, he might have been convinced by our arguments and he could have changed his opinion.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Sir, is it necessary that the member should listen to the debate to qualify himself to vote ? This is not a question to be debated upon. My friend forgets another thing. This is, after all, a parliamentary type of Government. The party decisions have the major part. Some Members may feel interested in some measures and some other members may be interested in some other measures. Therefore, the question of listening to the debate is mostly irrelevant.

One important argument was advanced by the Whip of the Opposition namely, that the dignity of the Members is going to be touched by this. It is a very funny argument. If a Member is in the library or in the lounge and if he is told that there is a division and is asked to come into the House, it is only a sort of request, a sort of reminder. It is not a question of doing anything contradictory to the dignity of the Members concerned. If the question of dignity arises, I would like to say that this method is adopted in all legislatures. I hope, with these remarks, they would give up their opposition to this and vote for this amendment.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—I request the Chair not to express any opinion before it is voted, because a request was made that the Chair should give its opinion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, no. I know it ; I will simply put it to the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, hitherto, you were offering some explanation to convince us.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore city).—Can we have the experience of the Speaker about the House of Commons ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have made up my mind whether I should say something or not. After it is voted either this way or that, I will say something. I will put the amendment to the House.

(MR. SPEAKER)

The question is:

"That for sub-rules (3) and (4), the following sub-rules shall be substituted:

"(3) If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of a question is challenged, he shall arrange to have the decision bell rung for two minutes.

(4) After the lapse of two minutes he shall have the doors closed and shall put the question a second time and invite those who are in favour of the motion to say 'Aye' and those against the motion to say 'No'.

(5) If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of the question is again challenged he shall ask the members who are for 'Aye' and those who are for 'No' respectively to rise in their places and, on a count being taken, declare the determination of the Assembly. In such a case, the names of the voters shall not be recorded.

(6) If the Speaker does not adopt the course provided for in sub-rule (5) he shall order a division to be taken in such other manner as he may determine."

The motion was adopted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಇರಬಹುದಾದ ಹಕ್ಕುಗಳನ್ನು ಪೊಟಕು ಮಾಡವುದಕ್ಕೂ(ನ್ಯ)ರ ಮತ್ತು ಮೆಜಾರಿಟಿ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಅನುಕೂಲಕ್ಕೂ(ನ್ಯ)ರ ಈ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಓಟುಮಾಡಿಸಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. We protest vehemently against this attitude. We stage a walk out and we do not participate in the discussion any further.

(At this stage, the Members of the Opposition Party withdrew from the House.)

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Rule 309. I beg to move:

"That the following words shall be added at the end of the sub-rule (2) and before the proviso—

"Or such part thereof as the Speaker may specify in the question".

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the following words shall be added at the end of the sub-rule (2) and before the proviso—

"Or such part thereof as the Speaker may specify in the question".

The motion was adopted.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—Sir, Rule 323 is unnecessary. I, therefore, suggest that the same may be voted down.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Rule 323 stand part of the Rules."

The motion was negatived.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I am not moving amendment to Rule 332. I beg to move the next amendment which is as follows:—

"That in 1 in Schedule I—

(i) the following shall be inserted as rule 1 and the other rules re-numbered:—

"(i) A member shall give notice of his intention for leave to introduce a Bill or move a Resolution fifteen clear days before the day, set apart for that class of Private Members' business on which he wants the motion to be taken up."

(ii) in rule 5 for the words 'commencement of the session' the words 'day on which he wants the Bill or the resolution to be taken up' shall be substituted.

"(iii) the illustration at the end shall be omitted.

2. This amendment shall be deemed to have taken effect from 1st February 1959."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That in 1 in Schedule I—

(i) the following shall be inserted as rule 1 and the other rules re-numbered:

"(i) A member shall give notice of his intention for leave to introduce a Bill or move a Resolution

fifteen clear days before the day, set apart for that class of Private Members' business on which he wants the motion to be taken up."

(ii) in rule 5 for the words 'commencement of the Session' the words 'day on which he wants the Bill or the resolution to be taken up' shall be substituted.

(iii) the illustration at the end shall be omitted.

2. This amendment shall be deemed to have taken effect from 1st February 1959."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE STATE AID TO INDUSTRIES BILL, 1958

Motion to consider.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—I beg to move:

"That the Mysore State Aid to Industries Bill, 1958, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore State Aid to Industries Bill, 1958, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

†Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, there are different laws relating to State aid to industries in force in the Mysore State. In order to have uniform legislation, the Mysore State Aid to Industries Bill, 1958 was introduced in the Legislative Assembly last time and after discussion on the Bill, this Bill was sent to a Joint Select Committee. The Bill was considered by the Joint Select Committee and it has approved the Bill with certain changes as indicated in the Report of the Select Committee. Sir, in clause 2 of the Bill, the Committee inserted definitions of 'Board' and 'Industry'. Clause 4 of the Bill relates to State Aid to Industries Board. The Committee has modified sub-clause (4) of this clause and made provision for filling up casual vacancies in the Board. Similarly, the Committee amended clause 9 which requires Directors to call for objections if the extent of aid applied for is Rs. 25,000 and more instead of Rs. 50,000. Similarly the Committee amended sub-clause (4) of this clause to make it clear that no aid should be granted if by a resolution supported by not less than 9 members of the Board rejection of the application was advised. Under clause 21, where the aid is given otherwise than by loan and is terminated, interest at 12½ per cent on the money value of the grant is realisable under the original Bill. The Committee has reduced this rate to 9 per cent. Similarly, the Committee has suggested other verbal amendments and all these verbal amendments and other amendments are before the House and they may be considered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore State Aid to Industries Bill, 1958, as reported by the Joint Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 2. There is an amendment.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I beg to move:

"That for sub-clause (*a*), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—

"(*a*) 'Corporation' means the Mysore Srate Financial Corporation established under the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951 (Central Act 63 of 1951);

For sub-clause (*f*), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—

"(*f*) 'small scale industry' means an industrial business or enterprise in which the capital invested does not exceed five lakhs of rupees;".

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved

"That for sub-clause (*a*), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely:—

"(*a*) 'Corporation' means the Mysore State Financial Corporation